DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 737 HE 008 927

AUTHOR	Duryea, E. D.; Hatch, Winslow R.
TITLE	Management of Learning. New Dimensions in Higher Education. Number 5.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OE-50013
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	46p.; Parts are marginally legible due to type size
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *Administrator Responsibility; Bibliographies; College Administration; Creativity; Educational Accountability; *Higher Education; Learning; *Literature Reviews; *Management; *Organizational Effectiveness; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

Areas of academic administration with which current thinking is concerned are indicated, and a conceptual scheme reflecting these areas and pointing to directions for future studies is suggested. Published and unpublished work that develops new insights into the theory, process, and operations of college and university administration is reviewed. It is concluded that the need for systematic study of administration is urgent since the limitations of much of the administrative process and organizational structure show up in the face of demands made on the institutions by society. Consideration is given to principles of management, administrator leadership effectiveness, and the relationship between bureaucracy and intellectual creativity within an institution. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145737

OE-50013

NEW DIMENSIONS in Higher Education

Number 5

Management of Learning

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education

2

Highlights

In nearly every aspect of society, increase in the size and complexity of man's organizations has become a 20th-century phenomenon. The task of organizing people in such enterprises is defined here as management. It connotes leadership and coordination in the broadest sense, not "managing" in the specific sense.

Universities and colleges now confront problems of organization not unlike that of their governmental and industrial counterparts. But they face a basically different situation, because their significant activity takes place in the minds of men—in scholarship and learning.

Systematic study of academic administration in terms of the unique characteristics of academic institutions has begun to appear. Scholars have turned their attention to administrative theory applicable to education; administrators and their associates have begun to examine more deeply the components which constitute the administrative process. Both activities point up insights which should help the president, dean, and other officers "on the firing line."

Among questions this report asks are the following:

1. Do principles of management which we have associated with industry, business, government, and other enterprises apply also to the academic arena?
2. How do administrators exert that leadership which helps to keep their institutions in tune with a rapidly changing environment so that colleges and universities continue to exercise intellectual leadership in society?
3. What is being done to make college and university administration more effective (and also more efficient) in terms of their uniquely academic nature?
4. How do administrators prevent a bureaucracy required to maintain the functioning of a large and complex organization from interfering with intellectual creativity which is at the heart of the educational enterprise?

OE-50013

NEW DIMENSIONS
in Higher Education

Number 5

Management of Learning

by
E. D. DURYEA

WINSLOW R. HATCH, *Editor*
Clearinghouse of Studies on Higher Education
Division of Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Abraham Ribicoff, *Secretary*
Office of Education
Sterling M. McMurrin, *Commissioner*

Printed 1960
Reprinted 1962
Reprinted 1966

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 20 cents

FOREWORD

THE PURPOSE of this report is to indicate the areas of academic administration with which current thinking is concerned, and to suggest a conceptual scheme reflecting these areas and pointing directions for future studies.

With this purpose, the report confines itself to reviewing significant and representative work, both published and unpublished, that develops new insights into the theory, the process, and the operations of college and university administration. It does not survey all recent research, nor does it report the particular outcomes of studies reviewed. The end product, and an important contribution of this report, is a structural design for ideas on the administration of higher education.

The author, dean of the Evening Division of Hofstra College, is an academic administrator with experience of practical problems. He was also associated with John Corson in the study of the governance of colleges and universities sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation.

It is hoped that this report will call attention to the newer ideas in college and university administration and provide further impetus to the development of this field.

HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR.,
Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education.
HAROLD A. HASWELL,
Director, Higher Education Programs Branch,
Division of Higher Education.

III

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TO THE PREPARATION of this report many students of academic administration have given the benefit of their knowledge and experience. Particular mention should be made of the assistance given by Dr. James D. Thompson, director of the Administrative Science Center at the University of Pittsburgh, and Dr. Daniel E. Griffiths, associate professor of educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Within the Division of Higher Education, many staff members have been involved in this publication and others in the series "New Dimensions in Higher Education." Credit for the evolution of the series, and for the staff working paper, "A Design for Cooperative Action," from which it grew, belongs to the entire staff of the Programs Branch, Division of Higher Education. In the process of publishing this report, valuable advice and comment were given by Dr. E. V. Hollis, Director, and Dr. S. V. Martorana, Chief, State and Regional Organization Section, College and University Administration Branch, Division of Higher Education. Particular credit should go to Dr. C. L. Neudling for editing and revision.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	III
Acknowledgments	IV
Introduction	1
Search for Administrative Theory: Category I	5
Analysis of Process, Structure, and Institutional Setting: Category II	10
Accumulation of Operating Data: Category III	26
Conclusion	30
References	32
Appendix I	35
Appendix II	36

Management of Learning

INTRODUCTION

IN Government, in business, in industry, in practically every aspect of society, the increase in the size and complexity of man's organizations has become a 20th-century phenomenon. With this increase, the task of organizing people in large enterprises has assumed major importance.

The problems inherent in administering large businesses and complex Government bureaucracies led, about 30 years ago, to a number of systematic analyses seeking in part "a science of administration." Henri Fayol and Mary P. Follett started a trend in this connection which is further illustrated by such classic statements as *Papers on the Science of Administration* (edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick) and *The Functions of the Executive* (Chester I. Barnard). A rapidly expanding bibliography gives evidence of continued effort to improve understanding of administration in large organizations.

Universities and colleges now confront similar conditions stemming from increased size and complexity. Educators have begun to examine more intensively the administrative relationships which characterize their institutions. This report will draw upon recent studies, articles, and other published material, as well as investigations underway but not in print, to illustrate this development.

Administration, an Activity in Need of Systematic Study

Some educators question the validity of such study on the premise that administration is essentially an art. In contrast, one business school professor has urged the "reduction of educational objectives into measurable and hence controllable terms."

This report presents a middle ground, suggesting that much can be done to derive, if not a science for administration, at least greater insights into man's organizational relationships. Such insights will enable administrators to understand better what makes them function more effectively. This report therefore adheres to the following assumptions:

1. That administrative activity is increasingly a universal concern for man. He more and more works and lives as a part of larger and more complex

organizations. These organizations require direction and control. Just as man by the creative use of his intelligence has achieved a greater control over his physical environment, so can he improve his ability to handle his organizational activities. By applying intelligence and knowledge to administrative relationships and procedures, he can develop guide lines to direct decisions.

2. That administration as an activity has components which permeate the various kinds of institutions and specialized fields of endeavor. Colleges and universities can benefit from the insights of administration in business and Government. All deal with one common element—men and women.

Basic Assumption: The Need for Effective Administration To Meet Problems of Size and Complexity

Widespread attention has been given to the increasing pressures upon college and university administrators. Swelling enrollments and demands for increased services are difficult to accommodate because of limitations upon financial resources and increasing costs of operation. Growth in size and complexity has in the larger institutions led to an administrative bureaucracy of personnel and procedures. This has occurred at a time when the rate of change in man's social institutions and in his control over his physical environment is accelerating geometrically.

For the college and university administrator, this prompts two basic questions:

1. How do administrators exert that kind of leadership which helps to keep their institutions in tune with a rapidly changing environment so that they maintain their position of intellectual leadership and vital educational functioning? Stated differently, what administrative procedures and relationships facilitate adjustments to changing conditions?
2. How do administrators prevent a bureaucracy required to maintain the functioning of a large and complex organization from interfering with intellectual creativity which is at the heart of the educational enterprise? Must increased formalization of relationships and procedures curtail the individual freedom implicit in teaching and scholarship?

Changes are called for, obviously. It is the function of administration to provide the initiative for change. A refinement or reorganization of our administrative arrangements and personnel is apparently required if the administrator is to become an instrument in change.

To fashion such an instrument, facts and figures need to be assembled; the experiences, insights, new ideas, and theoretical postulates of creative administrators need to be examined. "Breakthrough" concepts in the field of academic administration are required.

Plan for Study of Administration: The Scope of This Report

The report to follow will survey what is being done to increase our knowledge of administrative procedures and relationships as they

involve boards, presidents, and general administrative officers. The focus is upon the administration of a college or a university as an entity.

Sources of Information

Preparation of this report has involved a survey of the literature and of administrators and scholars to identify current studies and thinking upon these problems. Organizations especially concerned with systematic investigations into these matters include: The Southern Regional Education Board; The Administrative Science Center at the University of Pittsburgh; the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago; the University Council for Educational Administration; Centers or Institutes for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, the University of Michigan, and Teachers College, Columbia University; and the office for the Study of the College and University President in Princeton, N.J. The material to follow reflects the activities of these organizations as well as the individual efforts of a number of other scholars and administrators. The literature since 1953 has also been reviewed.

Specific references will be cited briefly so that they can be identified in the list of references at the end of this report. Again, it should be stressed that the material included is an illustrative, rather than a complete, listing of pertinent studies and publications.

Categories of Investigation

In general, the work underway or published in recent years can be considered under three general categories. These categories obviously do not provide the only possible structure for a report of this kind. They do suggest a logical organization of the material considered and a general conceptual scheme for further study which can serve to coordinate the work of individuals and offices toward improvement of academic administration.

The first category is that of *theories* of administration. Business management and governmental bureaucracy have established precedents in a body of theory. Only in recent years have educators and social scientists begun to develop postulates for the administration of schools, colleges, and universities to serve as guides to practice.

A second category consists of studies and writings which deal with the *analysis* of administrative processes, organizational relationships, and their institutional environment. Examples are the concept of decision making and what it encompasses, analyses of colleges and

universities in terms of formal and informal structures, and the roles of units in academic government.

The third category is that of *application or operation.* Self-surveys, experimental programs, institutional research, and similar activities illustrate the procedures employed to obtain the information needed for intelligent operation. By gathering data about a specific institution or comparable institutions, analyzing and communicating such data to appropriate administrators, provision is made for more effective decision making. A steady accumulation of such material—formally through studies and reports, and informally through personal associations—is the basis for the improvement of individual colleges and universities.

This report will examine each category in turn.

SEARCH FOR ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY

CATEGORY I

AS ADMINISTRATORS and students of administration address themselves to the problems of the academic enterprise, they will accumulate not only an increasing body of data but a sound basis for generalization. Inevitably this generalization will lead to sharper definition of problems as well as hypotheses likely to improve understanding and prediction of administrative processes.

The literature in other fields such as public and business administration (as evidenced by such "classics" as the writings of Mary Parker Follett, Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, Max Weber, Chester I. Barnard, and Herbert A. Simon) indicates that such a development can be expected. It is equally clear that, in the last few years, students of educational administration have seriously begun the work of formulating a body of theories for such administration. Two recent publications illustrate this development. Both propose definitions of administrative theory, and both describe a number of new theoretical propositions.

In a short book *Administrative Theory*, published in 1959, Daniel E. Griffiths has written what he calls "an interim statement setting forth the understanding we now have" of administrative theory and has discussed recent attempts at theorizing in administration.[1]

In 1957, the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago held a seminar for 60 professors and deans to consider this problem. Out of this meeting has come a report, *Administrative Theory in Education*, edited by Andrew W. Halpin. The report includes eight papers on the development of theory, the relationship of theory to practice, and new approaches to the study of theory.

Both publications are allied to the work of three national organizations: The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (founded in 1947), the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (founded in 1950 with Kellogg Foundation support), and the University Council for Educational Administration (formed in 1956 with Kellogg Foundation financing).

---

[1] Also included in a second publication by Griffiths, *Research in Educational Administration*, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Other pertinent articles have appeared in the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, published by the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University.[2] The Administrative Science Center of the University of Pittsburgh, with a staff including sociologists, social psychologists, and anthropologists, has advanced hypotheses which have significance for higher education. A number of behavioral scientists—among them Ralph W. Tyler, David Riesman, Theodore Caplow, and Talcott Parsons—also have proposed theories on administrative relationships.

A distinctive concern of these contemporary writers is the note of universality. Theories which explain how human beings are organized to carry out identifiable organizational functions can apply to a high degree in all kinds of enterprises, although they may be derived from a single one.

What Is Theory?

Gulick and Urwick and other early writers conceived of a "science of administration" almost purely in a taxonomic sense. More recent theorists have placed greater emphasis on methodology having its basis in the findings of the social and natural sciences. They have relied upon mathematical and statistical tools; they have attempted to establish carefully defined concepts to describe situations in operational terms and to establish an accurate language; they have sought to develop hypotheses gained from observational, statistical, and other data. They have sought to make it possible not only to understand the administrative process better but to predict consequences of decisions. Professor Griffiths, for example, has proposed four purposes of theory: (1) as a guide to action and the "consequence of action"; (2) as a guide in the collection of data through a clear perception of the relationship of facts; (3) as a guide in the accumulation of new knowledge; and (4) as a guide to the "nature of administration" in terms both of its structure and its function.

But hypotheses of any kind are not only developed from other concepts or hypotheses but must ultimately be tested in situations where it is possible to observe outcomes. At the point at which a hypothesis predicts an operational consequence, its validity undergoes that test. Theory for educational administration, as distinct from that for administration in general, must be validated by observed (and if possible measured) results of application in educational institutions.

---

[2] *Public Administration Review* (Winter 1960) includes several related articles.

What Hypotheses Have Been Proposed?

Administrative theory is concerned with human behavior in an organizational setting. Phillip Selznick writes in his 1957 book, *Leadership in Administration*, that "the technical, rational, impersonal, task-oriented formal system (the organization) is conditioned by responsive interaction of persons and groups."[3] This responsive interaction, he says, in time becomes a social structure. This structuring is historical in that it solidifies in terms of the experience of a particular organization; it is functional in that it reflects the adaptation of the organization to internal and external social environments; and it is dynamic in that it generates new and active forces from the actions and reactions of its constituency.

What do we know about how people act in formal organizations? What hypotheses attempt to portray accurately the elements essential to the formal structuring of relationships of individuals and groups to achieve a functioning organization? What hypotheses explain and predict the behavior of individuals in their relationship to the organization or the behavior of people as members of formal and informal groups associated with an organization? What attempts have been made to develop a general conceptual scheme for a theory of formal organization?

The Griffiths and Halpin references mentioned above contain some of the answers proposed for these kinds of questions. In addition to establishing possible conceptual frameworks, each considers some of the recent contributions to theoretical analysis. This report would serve no purpose by further discussion of these at this point, except to note that other references include specific theoretical concepts.[4]

It suffices to say here that theoretical studies tend to concentrate around the two general topics of process and sociology.

---

[3] *Leadership in Administration*, Rowe, Peterson, White Plains, New York, 1957, p. 39.

[4] For example, Theodore Caplow, in an article in *Social Forces* in 1953, proposed the following hypotheses: "A social organization, being an entity with definite structural characteristics, can only continue in existence if certain invariable requirements are met. These requirements consist of those imposed by the resistance of the external environment to the objective goals of the organization, those created by latent or manifest conflict among the component suborganizations, and those imposed by individual members as a condition for continued participation. A successful organization is one which shows, for its institutional type, a minimum of inconsistency among these purposes, so that the effective achievement of organizational goals contributes to the self-maintenance of the group, the minimization of spontaneous conflict, and the satisfaction of individual needs."

In a more recent unpublished paper, James D. Thompson proposed an analysis of academic relationships in terms of "truth strategies." His point is that the various disciplines in general rely on a combination of two elements: experience and reasoning. Academic disciplines can be categorized by the degree to which their reasoning is codified. Their personnel, their curricular content and structure, their relationships to other disciplines relate to these factors. Thompson suggests that evidence assembled and analyzed in terms of this *might* shed new light on higher education.

The theories of Talcott Parsons, Herbert A. Simon, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Edward H. Litchfield emphasize the administrative process. Parsons, for example, explains the relationships of what he terms the three different levels of the organizational hierarchy: the overseers or boards or similar top structure, the managerial group in general control, and the technical personnel who know the specific operations of the organization. The hypotheses of Simon, Griffiths, and Litchfield point to decision making as the fundamental activity of administrators.

The other general basis for theorizing can be called organizational sociology. In 1956, Talcott Parsons wrote two articles for the *Administrative Science Quarterly* which he entitled "Sociological Approach to Theory of Organizations, I and II." In these articles he sought to examine organizations—business, military, and academic—in terms of general sociological theory. In a report of the American Council on Education Conference on Faculty-Administration Relationships in 1957, Ralph W. Tyler discussed a few developments "to illustrate the relevance of the behavioral sciences to an understanding of the problems of relations between faculty and administration." In a paper on *Administration Theory in Education*, Jacob W. Getzels stressed the importance of role and personality "to show that the process of administration deals essentially with social behavior in a hierarchical setting." In the same volume, Carroll L. Shartle proposed "a theoretical framework for the study of behavior in organizations." His paper grew out of the concepts and findings of the Ohio State Leadership Studies at Ohio State University.

This stress upon the roles and relationships of people as individuals and as groups is held also by other writers. James I. Doi, director of institutional research at the University of Colorado, for example, in a letter to the author stressed the importance of investigation based on a conceptual framework involving the roles and role expectations of participants. The Administrative Science Center at the University of Pittsburgh is concerned with analysis and theory of administration based upon the social sciences. At Harvard University and at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, studies are underway to interpret the impact of the college upon its students. Peabody College has been concerned with hypotheses based upon the factors of competency in performing administrative tasks.[5]

[5] A number of scholars have developed their theoretical analysis in terms of statistical methodology. This is also characteristic of the Ohio State Leadership Studies.

Significance of Theory for This Report

This brief discussion of administrative theory serves only to identify a potential scope for investigation of academic administration and a kind of framework which can evolve as conceptual thinking expands in the future.

Whether the element of prediction of administrative behavior will reach a degree of effectiveness where it can guide educational decision making remains a moot point. But there is clear evidence to this writer that the present and past concentration on data accumulation for operational decisions will not suffice. Such investigation must not only continue but expand, of course. It will help to overcome that famine of pertinent information which pervades the administrative land today. But more penetrating questions as to what actually occurs on a campus will be asked more frequently. Insightful answers will come only as we really begin to know what decision making and the administrative process involve, what kinds of roles and relationships account for the kinds of decisions made, what factors affect faculty morale and effective interaction among participants, and similar perceptions.

ANALYSIS OF PROCESS, STRUCTURE, AND INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

CATEGORY II

IF A SOPHISTICATED THEORY of educational administration existed, this category would conceivably serve no purpose. Theory would establish a basic conceptual scheme within which further studies would fit logically. Theory would provide, as Professor Griffiths indicated, the guide to the accumulation of new data essential for a clearer perception of the relationships and the administrative actions of presidents, deans, chairmen, and other officers.

The point in establishing this second category of studies is simply this. Theorists are concerned with hypotheses which not only explain but predict. Studies arising out of theoretical considerations tend to stress the confirmation or rejection of these considerations. In part, such also is the purpose of the studies referred to in this category. But since theory remains incomplete, studies not based upon theory remain valid. Moreover, educators facing the complexities of size and consequent problems of directing change and making bureaucracy effective in the academic setting cannot wait for the logical development of theoretical considerations.

Analysis in this category can open additional avenues for insightful excursions which broaden the perceptions of those who strive for a general conceptual scheme of administrative behavior or who seek pertinent data. There are no clear boundaries. It is a matter primarily of emphasis: the theories dwell on ideas with universal application and the potential of predicting consequences of behavior with considerable consistency; the analytical studies on clearer insights into the elements which bear upon administrative action with or without a theoretical premise.

To look at this matter from another perspective, studies and data accumulation to meet the immediate problems of administrative operation do not produce sufficient insights into the more basic factors inherent in academic institutions. Students of educational administration have begun to seek more meaningful insights into organization, structure, and institutional setting.

Proposed below are three areas which call for analytical study. First, however, it is necessary to establish three operational definitions

for administration, organizational structure, and institutions. These comprise the aspects of college and university administration with which this study is concerned. Our definitions are intended only for the purposes of this paper.[1]

Administration.—By "administration" we mean activity or process. Specifically, administration refers to the activity in a university and college by which decisions are made and implemented, policies formulated and communicated, and routine processes carried on. Stated somewhat differently, it is the activity by which policy is formulated and the functions of the institutions maintained.

Organizational structure.—By "organizational structure" we mean the formally established roles and relationships and the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of governing boards, presidents, and their executive staffs,[2] academic deans, department chairmen, and faculties. Not included are the informal relationships which surround and influence the formal structure.

Institution.—By "institution" is meant that identifiable entity—both physical and organizational—which encompasses the various participants in the performance of established functions. The reference here is to a college or a university as an established and widely recognized enterprise.

Areas for Study

An organization is an arrangement, an ordering, of the parts in a whole. The composition of these parts—trustees, presidents, deans, chairmen, and faculties—and their interaction determine to a large extent the effectiveness of the administrative process. For effective administration, participants need to determine clearly the relationships of the parts and to establish administrative policy and base decisions on an accurate estimate of these relationships.

As institutions become larger and their functions more diverse, the structure becomes more complex. One need only compare the relationships and consequent bureaucracy to be found in a modern State university with the informal situation which characterizes a small liberal arts college. It has become not only increasingly clear

[1] Until clearly phrased and generally accepted definitions have been established, variations in the use of such terms will exist. For example, Albert Lepawsky (*Administration*, Knopf, 1955) distinguishes between administration, management, and organization. He defines organization as a process "combining the work which individuals or groups have to perform" (p. 35). In his book, *Administrative Theory*, Griffiths, in part, defines administration as a "process of directing and controlling life in a social organization" (p. 72). As studies accumulate, consensus definitions of these and other such terms undoubtedly will evolve.

[2] This category of "staff" includes not only assistants working directly with the president but the central administrative officers such as deans of students, registrars, directors of admission, business officers, and others concerned with the nonacademic operations. Some universities have centralized their operations under a limited number of heads or vice presidents; i.e., academic vice president, financial or business vice president, public relations vice president, and student personnel vice president. In terms of academic government, however, the last three usually report directly to the president and have a hierarchical relationship to him, while deans, chairmen, and other officers related more directly to the academic functions have a generally recognized autonomy.

but increasingly imperative that participants in the academic operation have a clear understanding of the organizational structure of their institution.

Both process and structure are related to institutional setting. This constitutes what John J. Corson has called the "ecology of governance." The influence of external and internal pressures [3] comes to focus in the decision-making activity which constitutes the administrative process. This, combined with formal roles and relationships of participants, determines the character or "personality" of each institution and thus influences the kind of educational program it will have, the services it will perform, the character of its personnel, and the other determinants of its role in society.

It would seem then, that an understanding of administration in higher education requires analysis of each role of the three elements:

(1) *Administrative process:* What elements are involved in the making and implementing of policies and other decisions?

(2) *Structural relationships:* What are the roles and relationships of administrative officers and bodies? What influences do various governing units have on institutional policies? What is the "flow of authority" in academic administration?

(3) *Institutional setting:* What influences do informal groups and personal relationships have on administrative decisions? What influences in academic organizations limit or foster possible courses of action? What patterns of values permeate the professional personnel of colleges and universities and influence decision making? What external pressures influence the making of decisions?

Administrative Process

In the small college enrolling a few hunderd students and having few faculty members and administrative officers, face-to-face contacts provide opportunities for the exchange of information and opinion necessary for effective operation. In many small colleges, grown to medium size since World War II, these informal processes collapse. If formal arrangements are not substituted, the void is not filled and the administration of the college suffers.

How many colleges today—faced with a growing bureaucracy of administrative offices and services—systematically analyze their situation to develop new administrative arrangements? If they do, what basis do they have for making decisions concerning their administration and organizational structure, other than that which seems to work

[3] These pressures come from a variety of elements. Among external influences are professional and accrediting associations, parents, alumni, donors, and governments. Internal factors include values and allegiances held by individuals to professions, academic disciplines, informal groups, and the institution; formal roles and relationships, traditions, commitments to educational functions and services, students, and other influences.

well somewhere else? Is there a value to a careful and logical analysis of the administrative process? Can such analysis have application to a local situation and assist in the ordering of new arrangements which help rather than hinder intelligent and effective decisions on purposes, curricula, degree requirements, research activities, instructional effectiveness, evaluation methods, and the other factors in educational operations?

Little study has been made of these problems. Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield of the University of Pittsburgh has studied some of them and proposes that the administrative process may be viewed as a five-stage cycle. In brief, he indicates that rational administrative process involves (1) the making of decisions which (2) are programed into a plan for implementation and then (3) communicated along with the programing to all participants concerned, (4) controlled so that actions implementing them are measured in terms of established norms, and (5) reappraised on the basis of changed conditions, new information, etc.

Litchfield's analysis appeared in 1956 in the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, while he was dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University.[4] In articles published in the October and December 1959 issues of the *Journal of Higher Education*, he has applied this analysis to the organization of large universities.

Obviously, administrative process does not always move through all of Litchfield's five stages. The process of decision making may include arrangements for programing; programing may lead to immediate reappraisal of the initial decision; communicating may bring to light factors which cause an immediate reappraisal.

Other writers have proposed similar patterns. The proposal of Chancellor Litchfield, however, constitutes the kind of analysis that is valuable in the study of administrative organization. It is an effective device which forces the decision maker to think through what is involved in a decision, what actions should follow its making, what kinds of data should be considered, and what persons should be involved. It establishes a basis for further study of the elements of administration.[5]

Academic administration is, however, more than just a cycle of activities. To a far greater degree than in public or business administration, it requires effective collaboration among the professional

[4] Litchfield's initial proposal was in the form of a hypothesis to explain the administrative process. As such, it relates directly to theories of administration developed in connection with process and decision making. It also forms a basis for analysis, and therefore has a value to students of administration other than as a part of administrative theory. It parallels other studies discussed under this category.

[5] Another breakdown of the process of making and implementing decisions for educational institutions is proposed by Griffiths in *Administrative Theory*.

personnel of the institution. D. C. Stone, writing on the relations of presidents and faculties, notes that "administration is, in reality, more a process involving a considerable number of persons who are accountable for various phases of college operations. Its essence is responsible leadership acting through consultation."

Investigation of this aspect of administrative process could productively consider such questions as: To what degree does experience in, and knowledge of, public and business administration provide data, procedures, and insights of value to colleges and universities? To what degree is the academic problem unique? How should faculties be involved in the administrative process? How can policymaking and policy implementing be related to the advantage of both? What controls are effective in the autonomous, decentralized structure of the modern university? How can appraisal be made an integral part of decision making and the routine administrative process?

Structural Relationships

No president or other administrative officer survives long or wields effective control who fails to understand the varied interactions among the units of academic government. Yet, as noted on the pages to follow, little has been done to investigate systematically the formal roles and relationships of administrators in colleges and universities. Nor have extensive systematic analyses been made of the informal roles and relationships described in the following section on the institutional setting.

An experimental view of higher education readily reveals a common pattern of organizational structure for nearly all institutions. Governing boards hold final, legal authority. Presidents tend to serve in a dual relationship as executives for boards and leaders of their faculties. A power flow routes executive authority from presidents through deans and departmental chairmen to faculty members, on the one hand, and legislative initiative moves from individual faculty members to departmental, school, or college faculties to institutionwide senates, councils, or faculty meetings for educational policy, on the other. Because the professionalized personnel of departments are committed to specialized disciplines, departments play a highly autonomous role within the organization.[6] The executive direction of a college, accordingly, does not have that "down the line" authority associated with the administration of business and government. Decisions at the departmental, school, or college level—especially those which deal with the employment and advancement of personnel—tend

[6] In this sense, professional schools tend to act in the same manner as academic departments in the arts and sciences.

to reflect commitments to disciplines and professions rather than to the policies of the institution.

Individual colleges and universities, of course, differ in the authority and responsibility held by various units of academic government. Local traditions, local functions and purposes, geographical location, relations with supporting governments and donors, student clientele, attitudes, values and capabilities of individual participants, and similar elements combine to give each campus a particular pattern of authority and of relationships. In some institutions presidents serve as highly authoritarian executives; in others, they find it difficult to exert educational leadership because their faculties are highly independent and autonomous. That such problems concern administrators is made clear at professional meetings attended by board members, presidents, academic administrators, and faculty members.

Despite this expressed concern, investigation disclosed relatively few studies which focus on the problems involved. Those which do are for the most part inchoate and uncoordinated. From the limited data available, it would appear that two kinds of studies would be very profitable. One would examine the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of individual units of government. The other would study academic organizations as total structures.

An encompassing examination of both of these elements is reported in an as yet unpublished report to the Carnegie Corporation written by John J. Corson. Corson has identified "the distinctive characteristics of the university as an administrative enterprise." In terms of these distinctive characteristics, he has analyzed the functioning of universitywide officers (trustees and presidents), functioning of academic officers (deans and chairmen), and the functioning of faculties. He has raised questions which, if examined, would provide administration with a literature.

Corson's ideas are basic in any systematic investigation of the problem. Still other studies indicate what is underway and what can be done.

Studies Illustrative of the Research on Organizational Structure

The task of the president as the executive for a university with thousands or tens of thousands of students and hundreds or thousands of professional personnel is proving increasingly onerous and demanding. Presidents are both verbal and well connected; so it is not surprising that one comprehensive study is underway on the problems of this office. With the support of the Carnegie Corporation, Harold W. Doods, former president of Princeton University, has carried out

with a team of 3 an inspection of 50 colleges and universities. His group is analyzing the role of the president as educator, administrator, fundraiser, and interpreter of his institution. It will produce a body of organized information based upon observation and—to a lesser degree—on statistical data. Some clue to the direction further research on the presidency might take is found in a doctoral thesis completed in 1956 by Richard W. Stephens. In what he calls a "content analysis" of personal documents and published materials written by or about the present and former presidents of 45 major American universities, Stephens has put together an overview of presidential functions and relationships.

In the academic hierarchy, trustees are plagued by the fact that they have full legal responsibility but limited operational control. A comprehensive account of the legal basis for the control of boards may be found in the 1935 American Council on Education report written by Alexander Brody, *The American State and Higher Education.* Most publications on the role of trustees have tended to be handbooks such as the *Manual for Trustees* prepared in 1945 by Raymond M. Hughes. One of the most penetrating of these handbooks was published this year by Morton A. Rauh under the sponsorship of the Institute for College and University Administrators at Harvard University. Rauh discusses what he considers to be the vital areas for effective board participation in academic government and suggests areas that require further study.

No study, however, is apparently underway that might suggest what can be done to meet the pressing need for ideas and data which can help boards and college presidents clarify the role of trustees. This need was stressed in the 1957 "Paley Report," *The Role of Trustees of Columbia University*, by a committee of trustees. The problem raised by this committee, in essence, is: How can trustees carry out their public responsibility of supervising their institutions when they are substantially or almost completely separated from the paramount function of their organization, its educational program?

Since the history of the last hundred years of American higher education has been one of decentralized expansion, the roles of deans and departmental chairmen have become increasingly crucial. Three studies show the kind of investigation which can help identify more clearly the place of departmental chairmen in the hierarchical structure and the kind of evaluation which might be applied to their functioning. No similar studies apparently have been made for academic deans. In 1953, Rev. Edward A. Doyle surveyed 33 colleges to determine how the work of departmental chairmen was divided among instruction, advisement, student affairs, and general administration. In a different vein, John K. Hemphill (Ohio State Leadership Studies) analyzed statistically the replies of more than 200 faculty

members concerning the reputation of departments and the relationship of these replies to the effectiveness of departmental leadership. Ben Euwema, in a 1953 article, examined departments in terms of optimum size, selection of chairmen, internal organization, and personnel policies.[7]

Because graduate and evening deans are relatively new on the academic scene, their position in relation to other academic officers has caused them concerns not so common to the more traditional officers. The Executive Committee of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Colleges, in the report of a 1957 questionnaire filled in by 36 out of 38 member institutions, gives data on prevailing practice as related to jurisdiction, responsibilities, and influence of these officers. A more insightful study was made by a committee of the Association of University Evening Colleges in 1954, but was never published. This group sponsored a personal interview survey in eight representative institutions to determine how the role and function of the evening administration was viewed by other academic deans.[8]

The role of faculties in university governance has long been subject to considerable discussion, usually quite partisan. The prerogatives which faculties should hold received the most careful enunciation in the well-known "Committee T" report of the American Association of University Professors. This analysis considers the rights of faculties rather than their role in institutional policymaking. Charles P. Dennison came closest to this latter perspective in his 1955 book on the formal authorities of faculties, which reported a survey of the statutes of eight liberal arts colleges. He found, for example, that while only two colleges provided explicit faculty authority in academic matters, all respected the faculty voice in practice.[9]

Limitations of Available Material

The studies consulted for this survey have begun the essential task of accumulating data, but do not answer the basic questions.

How, for example, does the administrator overcome resistance to educational experiment? Do departments act as "veto groups,"

[7] A study more directly related to the roles and relationships of chairmen in an organizational sense has been proposed by the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Shannon McCune, provost at that institution, seeks to analyze the problems of departmental structure and role within the context of the educational functioning of Smith College, Mount Holyoke College, Amherst College, and the University.

[8] Ernest E. McMahon, dean of the University College of Rutgers University, this year completed a thesis entitled, "The Emerging Evening College: A Study of Faculty Organization and Academic Control in 10 Eastern University Evening Colleges" (Columbia University, 1959).

[9] A new doctoral thesis by K. William Leffland on "The College Administration and Faculty: A Study of Administrative Functions and Roles" may shed further light on the possibilities of studying the faculty role in academic structure.

analogous to political and social groups in society, as David Riesman reported in *Constraint and Variety in American Education?* Does their commitment to the existing structure and organization of knowledge mean they act to prevent new disciplines from evolving, to impede efforts to reorganize the curriculum in terms of contemporary knowledge, and to oppose changes aimed at better realization of institutional purposes?

How do we determine not only the existing role but the appropriate role for the individualistic, professional academician in the increasingly management-oriented administrative organization of a large university? How can these two conflicting tendencies—the important creative individualism of the faculty member and the essentially bureaucratic administrative arrangements—both be enhanced?

What kinds of decisions can the faculty be authorized to make without abridging the responsibilities of the trustees and the president for executive leadership and societal responsibility? What kinds of decisions do faculties have special competence to make? What limits should be placed on the participation of faculties in institutional decision making? Conversely, how can faculties make sure that administrators carry out the policies faculties adopt in areas where they have competence? How does the faculty governmental system of committees, departmental meetings, councils, senates, and faculty meetings mesh with the parallel administrative hierarchy of chairmen, deans, and presidents?

Pattern for Analysis

The foregoing discussion suggests three factors important for further investigation and some questions which illustrate the kind of study most likely to be productive.

1. The academic organization has a large number of unique characteristics which Corson identifies in his forthcoming report. Roles and relationships, strongly felt intellectual values, character of professional personnel, and other aspects of academic institutions comprise a distinctive situation. Structural patterns for other enterprises do not always suggest answers, nor sometimes even valuable ideas. This is a point not always recognized by governing boards and presidents.

A clearer understanding of these differences will open up a very productive area for research, as Caplow and McGee imply in their recent book:

> The university is a fascinating specimen of social organization, remarkably unlike any other. Its roots and some of its rituals go back to the Middle Ages and beyond, but its principal business is innovation. Its hierarchical

arrangements are simple and standardized, but the academic hierarchy includes a greater range of skills and greater diversity of tasks than any business or military organization. Above all, the university is remarkable for pursuing an intricate program with little agreement about fundamental purposes.[10]

2. The flow of authority from governing boards to administrative officers and faculty bodies contrasts and even conflicts with the flow of initiative from department chairmen and individual faculty members. This contrast in power from legal authority as against that from control of initiative shows up most dramatically in decisions on educational program and selection of faculty members.

James D. Thompson at the University of Pittsburgh has made a preliminary analysis of this contrast or conflict of what he calls legal as against inherent power. Legal power grows out of the responsibility of governing boards to the larger community and their position as custodians of their institutions. They delegate this power to presidents and administrative staffs for the executive direction of colleges and universities and, frequently, to faculties for the approval of educational programs. Inherent power rests upon the experience, the talents, and the occupational genius employed in the pursuit and propagation of knowledge. Faculties monopolize the necessary understanding of the subject matter and contacts with others in "the field" and thus make the decisions which shape the academic functions of their institutions. This knowledge, with subsequent initiative in proposing new faculty members, curricular changes, and similar matters, blunts the force of executive authority from boards and presidents.

The effective functioning of an institution depends upon a realistic understanding of these two powers. Does the president act, for example, as Hutchins has suggested: "more like a political leader than any other kind of administrator," but lacking the power of party and patronage?[11] Will faculty bodies, representing as they frequently do a status quo position in knowledge and academic organization, initiate the kind of creative educational programing and scholarly production essential for continued institutional vigor in a changing environment? On the operational side, does institutional structure provide for that essential coordination between educational and financial decision making which assures appropriate support for academic programs? More specifically, do curriculum committees coordinate their policy decisions with those of budget officers, and vice versa?

3. A greater degree of decentralization has accompanied the growth of universities than that of other enterprises. What is more, this has taken place largely without what Selznick called the indis-

[10] Caplow and McGee, *The Academic Marketplace*, Basic Books, 1958, p. 4.
[11] Hutchins, Robert M., *Freedom, Education, and the Fund*, Meridian, 1956, p. 168.

pensable homogeneity of well-understood and widely accepted institutional policies. Participants in university administrative processes tend to lack a general orientation to institutional purposes and functions.

Study aimed at improving the effectiveness of academic administration must grapple with this problem. If departments are to remain the basic administrative units, for example, how can their decisions become actively related to institutionwide policies? Or, should schools and colleges rather than departments serve as the basic units for carrying out institutional policies?

Fundamental even to this is the relationship between organizational decentralization and the kind of scholarly inquiry accepted as vital to higher education. Is the present structure the best kind to support the intellectual freedom of individual faculty members? To date, little effort has been made to relate the structure of universities to their functions, and particularly to ther basic and most important function of creative teaching and scholarship.

Questions for Further Study

Consideration of conditions essential to the contributions of teachers and scholars suggest a number of questions for further study.

1. What is the nature of educational leadership? How can presidents and other administrators gain adherence to institutional policies without transgressing on d sciplinary initiative? Does executive ability in colleges and universities d ffer from that in other enterprises?
2. How can the l ind of decentralized organization associated with intellectual freedom be ma intained while institutions achieve a higher degree of efficiency and a greater effectiveness in performing appropriate functions? What means can serve to coordinate units of governance: to involve members of boards, for example, actively in academic matters; to coordinate faculty decisions with administrative implementation; to gain departmental cooperation in selecting the kind of instructional staff needed for the primary teaching or research functions of the institution? In effect, how can academic personnel become sensitive to the importance of adequate communication and to the functioning of the total organization?
3. What should be the basic administrative unit for academic areas? Does the department serve this function best and, if so, how can a great many individual departments be coordinated in terms of institutional policies? Should colleges or schools serve as basic units—as they do for many professional areas—rather than departments?
4. Does what Max Weber calls the power of bureaucracy, which rests upon its monopoly of specific knowledge, apply to universities to the extent that this sets limits on the degree to which presidents and administrators can effectively exercise direction?
5. Does the typical president, concerned with his lack of power to initiate, underestimate his total influence on the organization? Conversely, does the faculty, fearful of retaliation in terms of compensation and promotion

and cognizant of the threat of administrative veto, underestimate its position to direct policy decisions?

6. How can the office of the president as the center of both horizontal and vertical communications effect better coordination of all units of governance?
7. Would clarification and standardization of titles and roles of administrative officers, especially of deans, help to effect a better administrative organization within and among universities?

Institutional Setting

The administrative process and the relationships inherent in the institutional setting undoubtedly have much in common with their counterparts in other organizations. This report, however, is intentionally limited to academic organizations. The potential for, and the limit upon, achievement is clearly established by the nature of the academic institution in which the process and structure is established. This institutional setting has two components, each of which reflects the other.

One consists of the interaction of attitudes and values, personalities and abilities, and other aspects of the participating individuals and groups as evidenced in the purposes, functions, and internal patterns of relationship. Corson has called these the internal pressures on decisions.

The other consists of the external environment—primarily societal but also geographical and physical—within which the institution is set. In one sense, this external environment determines in part the nature of the student body, the character of the educational program, and the kind of faculty it is possible to attract. Unquestionably, to illustrate in an extreme sense, the centrally located rural university and the smalltown liberal arts college differ from their city counterparts. But more than this an institution which relies upon society—in one manner or another—for its support must keep pace with basic developments in this society. "If the college were wholly alien to its environment," Henry Wriston writes, "it could not perform its functions. . . . On the other hand, if it yields completely to its environment, it equally fails in its objectives. It must maintain a realistic contract without compromising its essential function." [12]

The pattern of the relationships within an organizational structure and the interaction of that structure with its environment can be explored in terms of the internal and external pressures on the administrative decision-making process. Corson has demonstrated the

[12] Wriston, Henry M., *The Nature of the Liberal Arts College*, Lawrence College Press, 1937, p. 20.

possibilities of this approach.[13] Some pressures support the existing situation; others exert influence for change. In the continuing succession of decisions through which an organization operates and in terms of the relative strengths of the various pressures, the character of an institution evolves or fails to evolve. This character, in turn, becomes identifiable with a college or university and becomes a positive factor itself in the determination of the activities of the organization. Over the years, this character takes recognizable shape as the cultural tradition which epitomizes a particular university or college.

An understanding of both the opportunities and limits in the character of the institution can give the administrator a realistic sense of his leadership potential. On a broader basis, this understanding gives deeper meaning to administrative process and structural organization. It is proposed here that such opportunities and limits be investigated more fully than has been done. Indicated below are the kinds of investigations currently available and the possibilities for further research they present.

Current Findings

One major contribution to the analysis of institutional setting is contained in Corson's report mentioned above. In this, he examines what he calls the "ecology of governance"—the external forces which help or hinder the college and university decision makers in adapting curriculums, courses, and instructional methods to the changing needs of society and young people. He contrasts the pressures of parents, alumni, contract research agencies, governments and governmental bureaus, professional associations, accrediting organizations, and individual and corporate donors. He indicates the dual effect of these external pressures and the internal forces which reflect the attitudes, values, and beliefs of the participants within an organization. To a degree the external forces tend to exert pressure for changes, the internal for the integrity of existing purposes and functions.

Both combine, writes Corson, to compose the institutional character, "le force majeure in governance." He adds: "Several scholars have demonstrated effectively that while rational or logical decision-making processes represent the ideal for any organization, the ideal is not often attained. . . . For decisions are, in considerable part, the result of conflict between tradition and the demand for change. They are the product of friction between contrasting philosophies. They are distilled from the currents and countercurrents that stem from the ambitions, anxieties, strivings, and resistances of individuals within and forces from without the institution."

[13] In his yet unpublished report to the Carnegie Corporation. See "References."

Another basis for analysis of institutional setting rests on the findings of behavioral scientists. Logan Wilson, in his 1942 book, *The Academic Man*, suggested the value of this kind of study. Tyler, in his paper [14] which pointed out how studies by behavioral scientists might apply to higher education, commented that what these disciplines [15] "can offer at present are methods and concepts useful in analyzing the situation in colleges and universities and generalizations drawn from other contexts." He proposed studying the behavior of faculty members and administrators viewed both as adult individual human beings active in a social context and as members of small groups. He also suggested study of the effects of the several kinds of social mobility which occur on campuses.

Two articles survey the literature which might be relevant for colleges and universities. One, by W. W. Charters, Jr., in 1952, lists a number of references which study roles of participants in an organization, leadership and authority relations, problems of communication, mobility of personnel, and influence of small groups. In the other, F. Stuart Chapin surveyed pertinent material as of 1957 under the headings of institutional change, relationship of change to individual needs, "the problem solving sequence" which considers the role differentiation among participants in making decisions, status in relation to institutional structure, and finally the relationship of size to effectiveness of committees.

Examples of the kinds of study which might have value are limited.[16] Two doctoral theses have dealt with phases of the problem. In 1951, Robert H. Kroepsch submitted a dissertation which demonstrated the effects upon morale of the difference between what faculty members expect from the institution and what they feel they actually obtain in terms of working conditions and relationships. In 1958, Richard R. Taylor completed a study of "The American University as a Behavioral System." He examined the "decision making patterns" of 30 academic departments in five major universities to gain insights into the effects of morale, size, and distribution of esteem within departments. His findings, however, were inconclusive, except to recommend further study. His thesis does help to define the problem.

---

[14] Ralph W. Tyler. American Council on Education 1957 Conference on Faculty-Administration Relationships mentioned in category I above.

[15] These usually include anthropology, political science, psychology, social psychology, and sociology.

[16] This survey disclosed other doctoral theses which suggest fruitful types of research. A number of these are listed in an appendix to this report. Review of this kind of research reveals that work done in other areas can provide illustrations of valuable approaches to a better understanding of the college and university setting. A thesis by Mary E. Webert Goss entitled, "Physicians in Bureaucracy: A Case Study of Professional Pressures on Organizational Roles" (Columbia University, 1959), examines a situation similar to the relationship of faculty members with professional associations and with their colleagues outside their institution.

In this connection, Reece J. McGee's thesis ("A Study in Ambience: The Numerical Analysis of Interaction Groupings in a Large Scale Organization," University of Minnesota, 1956) affords another illustration.

At this time, however, we do have evidence that some systematic study of the college and university field is under consideration. Tyler reports that the Social Science Research Council in 1955 "sponsored several memoranda outlining possible research programs for the study of higher education as a social institution." The American Sociological Society published in 1958 for the Russell Sage Foundation a report by Orville Brim, *Sociology and the Field of Education.* This reviews basic research studies which have employed the concepts and theories of sociology and indicates those areas of study which have been neglected by sociologists. In addition to his book on American education, David Riesman surveyed briefly what might be done in an article on planning in higher education.

One work which constitutes a major step in systematic examination of universities as social organizations appeared also in 1958. In *The Acedemic Marketplace*, Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee reported on a "study of the academic labor market." Another came out the same year as a study of "social scientists in a time of crisis," to determine the effect of the "McCarthy years" upon the faculty members most directly involved. This book, *The Academic Mind*, by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., makes a sociological and social-psychological analysis of faculty members.

Significance for Administration

While apparently only limited effort has gone into an analysis of the academic setting *per se*, the investigations mentioned above point to a new kind of research now underway. The increasing concentration by social scientists upon the problems of organized human relationships has begun to spill over into the academic field. It suggests an approach both refreshing and meaningful to the problem of keeping institutions dynamic in a changing social order.

For colleges and universities, the study of the institutional setting affords new horizons of understanding. A number of questions will illustrate the kind of data which such study can provide.

What are the external forces which influence colleges and universities and how is their influence felt? (Professional associations, for example, not only exert pressure by inspection and accreditations but tend to set values or norms for participants within institutions.)

What internal pressures are discernible? How do these relate to the external groups? How do they exert a counterforce on some matters and augment the

external pressures on others? To what exent are internal pressures related to the formal structure, or to informal groupings?

How do the values associated with personnel in higher education differ from those in other institutions? To what extent does adherence to professional and other values interfere with intelligent decisions in terms of institutional purposes? Are values correlated with subject matter areas, informal groups, institutional purposes, professional relationships, personal insecurities, etc.? What are the traditions associated with higher education in general and with individual institutions? To what extent do they influence decisions?

Do members of the academic profession exhibit common tempermental and psychological characteristics resulting from preference for their work, similar graduate training, and conditions of their employment such as remoteness from daily pressures of other enterprises, association with young people, and the like?

Answers to these questions will provide data for the institutional setting. Our purpose here, however, is not to analyze them but to stress their significance—to make clear that an intelligent grasp of the administrative operation needs such analysis. At any one time, decisions will be made within this framework, yet each decision will to some degree modify it. The administrator needs to understand the variety of different and sometimes conflicting or incompatible forces with which he must contend.

To this end, the character of an institution sets the boundaries within which participants may define or redefine its purposes and activities. This character is the framework for rational discussion by individuals and groups holding widely divergent values. Despite the desires of administrators, these and other pressures shape as well as conform to institutional purposes. The kind of students available will determine much of the intellectual caliber of the educational program. The sources of financial support may limit academic control of the institution's functioning. The attitudes of influential alumni may determine athletic policies. Research programs developed by Government agencies limit the kinds of contracts available to universities.

The institutional character reacts to these two major forces: (1) adherence to purposes and traditional functions, and (2) pressures exerted for and against these purposes and functions. The dynamic institution, resolving these forces in its distinctive context, will continuously evolve its particular character.[17]

[17] One final point, relevant for future studies, is that the entity we call the institution adds up to a whole which is not only more than its parts but which has an identity of its own. Not unlike the personality of an individual, this whole, in an institution which functions vitally, continually changes. Recognition of this situation has appeared to some degree in the literature. Dean J. Douglass Brown of Princeton University has coined the term "corporate personality." Prof. W. H. Cowley of Stanford University has stated that institutions retain attitudes, behavior patterns, and possessions which constitute a culture having continuity. On the whole, however, little effort has been made to analyze the administration of colleges and universities from this perspective.

ACCUMULATION OF OPERATING DATA
CATEGORY III

HUNDREDS of institutional self-studies, dozens of experimental programs, and a large number of books, articles, and printed or mimeographed publications have recorded the operating data of academic administration. These studies are listed in books and articles and in regular publications of the U.S. Office of Education and the American Council on Education. Such sources provide the president, the board member, the finance officer, the dean with data for use in making decisions on the various operational problems and policies faced in day-to-day activity.

This report is concerned more with the new ideas. The stress here is on developments taking place which give administrators an opportunity for a fresh—and perhaps more meaningful—look at their organizations. For this operational emphasis, we can discern some new directions in administrative planning.

The most recently published plan for a creative approach to administrative and curricular reorganization was proposed by Beardsley Ruml (*Memo to a College Trustee*, 1959) for liberal arts colleges. In effect the author says: Let's take a fresh and imaginative look at the entire institution. What kind of college do the trustees, administrators, and faculty members envisage for the next two decades? What kind of salaries and services will be required to maintain a first-rate institution? What alterations of the existing educational program, physical plant, and administrative staff will enable a college administration to achieve its aims within the limitations of its anticipated income? The Ruml approach suggests a new perspective for a traditional activity: the self-study.

The Ruml book suggests a way in which college administrators, faculties, and board members can look realistically at their present and future resources and face up to the kinds of changes necessary for an effective, high-caliber educational program. It stresses a major problem in planning for higher education; namely, the difficulty of bringing into decision-making councils the important and pertinent data.

Another effort in this same direction has been underway for a number of years under the leadership of John Dale Russell. Dr. Russell, as director of institutional research at New York University, has been

working with techniques for accumulating operational data and evaluating it for administrative officers. The pattern of his method appears in his studies of State systems of higher education, illustrated by that made in Michigan (*The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan*, 1958). The important element in this approach is the establishment of continuing procedures through which accumulated data are carefully analyzed and directed to appropriate administrative offices and faculty groups in a form designed to fit their operational needs. This method differs from self-studies by maintaining a continuous flow of information which has value for continuing decisions. It relates financial direction to educational program.

At New York University, Dr Russell's office is developing procedures for the continuing analysis of factors such as class size, instructional load, salary costs on various bases, degrees granted, clerical and supply costs, and a variety of other data. These data are used to maintain continuous planning and evaluation in the department, school, and total institution.

This type of pattern in administrative planning has appeared at other institutions. At least a dozen have formally named offices for institutional research. Comparative information should become more available systematically about class size, instructional loads, salary cost per student credit hour, degrees granted, administrative-to-instructional cost ratios, appropriate classroom sizes, maintenance and janitorial services, and the wide variety of activities which comprise the administrative operation of colleges and universities. These growing data should be coordinated on a national basis and related to the educational and research endeavor in ways which, like the Ruml report, suggest imaginative ways of improving institutional effectiveness.

An extension of this data-accumulating process to more than one institution has been announced by Earl J. McGrath, director of the Institute of Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. He plans a survey of 15 liberal arts colleges to measure the proliferation of instructional units in recent years. Such study may point to ways of reducing costs and at the same time improving educational programs.

In another dimension, a 10-member research team headed by Daniel E. Griffiths and John Hemphill has created a "simulated situational test." While designed for public school administrators, it demonstrates a new instrument for accumulating operational data for academic administrators. The group has developed a standardized administrative situation—a hypothetical but very realistic school environment—into which it is placing 232 elementary school principals selected from districts throughout the United States. By means of indoctrination sessions, visual aids, printed materials of various sorts,

and other mechanisms, these administrators are faced with realistic problems requiring decisions. On the basis of their reactions, data will be developed to give a clearer definition of the administrative process and possibly a guide in the selection of school administrators.

Two other reports illustrate other methods of probing into administrative problems. One is the Purdue Rating Scale for Administrators, reported by Robert L. Hobson through the Division of Educational Reference of Purdue University. This scale gives heads of larger offices an opportunity for intelligent and critical rating of their effectiveness by members of their staff. Forms are given to subordinates who send the answers directly to Purdue University. The division then provides the administrative head with a composite and anonymous report. Under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation, the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J., published in 1956 a survey of college evaluation methods and needs, written by Stuit, Helmstradter, and Frederiksen. This study provides not only a comprehensive plan for evaluating various aspects of college and university operations but a guide to methods and to literature. It is apparently the most complete analysis of evaluation directed at higher education.

Relationship to Other Studies

In this category a few of the more imaginative studies have been noted. We have not considered the numerous investigations completed or underway to help individual institutions or groups of institutions accumulate data necessary for important administrative decisions.[1] Such investigations have been excluded because this survey is more concerned with new points of view. Beyond the intent of a report, however, a fresh approach is very much called for. Both colleges and universities more than ever before are up against problems which require new solutions.

The liberal arts college, for example, faces the dichotomy inherent in the coming age of what amounts to mass higher education. Will it be overwhelmed by numbers and driven to mass techniques which relegate its efforts to a position parallel to that of the secondary school today? Will an attempt to maintain distinctive intellectual integrity mean isolation from the mainstream of society and consequent withering of support and status?

Similarly, in the words of John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation, "the role of the universities is undergoing a

[1] Examples are studies of the function of departmental chairmen proposed by the University of Massachusetts, of professional offerings by the vice president's office at Kent State University, and those listed in *Institutional Research in the West*, published in 1959 by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

remarkable change. They are being thrust into a position of great responsibility in our society—a position more central, more prominent, more crucial in the life of the society than academic people ever dreamed possible." [2] How will the variety of functions, from million-dollar research projects to the education of masses of undergraduate students, be adequately maintained in these institutions? Will graduate schools be able to cope with the increasing need for advanced degrees without changes of a drastic sort in their traditional programs and methods? Can specialization of increasingly sharp proportions be maintained for undergraduate faculties without hindering the educational reorganization inherent in handling large numbers of students?

It serves little purpose here, however, to delineate the characteristics of recent and potential changes in higher education. Scholars and educational leaders have done so on many occasions. The point we wish to raise in connection with this category is the importance of *not* planning for the future entirely in terms of the present and the past as, for example, so many institutional studies have done. Just as the 20th-century university could hardly pattern its functions upon the 19th-century classical college, the higher institution of the future will need to fit an age of widespread advanced education, great and rapid scientific and technological change, increased governmental coordination and support, and the other conditions of the changing structure of American and world society.

Studies such as those mentioned above point the way to more imaginative and forward-thinking investigation. In addition, it seems a most profitable possibility to coordinate research in academic administration, such as included in all three categories of this report, so that theory and more deeply probing analysis—particularly that done in conjunction with scholars having a broader view of the total social structure—can help to identify more positively the kinds of administrative functions and problems universities and colleges will face in the future.

[2] Address to annual meeting of the American Council on Education, Oct. 8–9, 1959.

CONCLUSION

THE STUDIES mentioned in this report illustrate the kinds of planning currently underway for the administration of higher institutions. As stated at the outset, this listing by no means exhausts the pertinent references.

They are presented in terms of a conceptual scheme. This has the advantage of establishing potential and existing relationships among studies and publications which to date remain quite uncoordinated. While this is not the only possible conceptual structure for investigation, some such arrangement is essential to the fruitful organization of administrative research.[1]

Quite obviously, the material in each of the categories might well have relevance to another. For example, Litchfield's ideas have been discussed in terms both of theory and of analysis. Some of the studies placed in the category of analysis undoubtedly have operational value. The point of the three categories in this report is primarily to suggest that scholars and administrators at work in administrative investigations generally have one of three intentions. They seek theories to improve understanding of the administrative process and prediction of the consequences of decisions. They turn to analysis to gain a broader understanding of administrative problems than immediate operational data provide and to "dig deeper" into ramifications. They face operational questions which require additional data for intelligent answers but do not necessarily require broader, more general hypotheses.

A coordination of effort in all three areas will enhance what is done in each and help to channel investigations into greater productivity. At the very least, coordination can help to prevent duplication of effort, can assure a communication of findings, and can make clear relationships between theory, analysis, and operations.

---

[1] Daniel E. Griffiths has published a book (*Research in Educational Administration*, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959) which discusses the current problems of research. In this, he proposes a national plan for the development and coordination of research in educational administration.

Another set of categories for studies of administration appears in a recent article by Griffiths and Laurence Iannaccone ("Administrative Theory, Relationships, and Preparation," *Review of Educational Research*, 28: 334–357, October 1958). The authors of this article have surveyed the literature for the period from 1955 to 1958. Their frame of reference for the organization of the studies described is that of public school administration essentially, but the administrative problems and environment are similar.

This report can best be concluded by posing a question basic to the study of administration, and by referring briefly to the implications of this question.

How can effective and efficient administration be achieved in highly decentralized enterprises lacking a clearcut commitment to a set of institutional functions and containing personnel with strong commitments to ideas, values, and professional associations which transcend their institutions?

Effective administration can be defined in terms of the achievement of creative scholarship and research which is communicated through teaching, publication, and other means to students and to the public. The effective institution, in this sense, is the one which maintains the function of intellectual leadership for society.

Furthermore, colleges and universities present to administrators a set of unique difficulties. The pervading intangibility of many aspects of administration at all levels and the absence of adequate standards and methods of appraisal tend to draw a haze over the making of decisions and to destroy the clarity of issues. The intellectual insularity of the faculty, the increasing demands of their specialties, their lack of training in administrative matters and indoctrination in the purposes of the institution, and their frequent distrust of administration present barriers to effective processes similar to but more sharply outlined than those in other enterprises.

Such characteristics create for universities and colleges a set of relationships which make most difficult the kind of planning, communication, direction, delegation, supervision, and evaluation possible in other enterprises. Yet, the foreseeable demands of the future already press for substantial adjustments in function and, to a degree, purpose if higher education will retain its vigor as the intellectual spearhead of American society.

To date, however, no body of literature addressed to this problem has appeared. The need for systematic study of administration becomes increasingly urgent as the limitations of much of our administrative process and organizational structure show up in the face of demands made on our institutions by our own and other changing cultures.

REFERENCES[1]

ABBOTT, FRANK C., *ed. Faculty-Administration Relationships, Report of a Work Conference, May 7–9, 1957.* Washington, American Council on Education, 1958. 88 p.

ARGYRIS, CHRIS. *Personality and Organization.* New York, Harper & Bros., 1957. 291 p.

BARNARD, CHESTER I. *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1938. xvi+334 p.

———. "The Functions of Status Systems," in *Reader in Bureaucracy.* R. K. Merton *and* others, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1952.

BRIM, ORVILLE G., *Jr. Sociology and the Field of Education.* Prepared for the American Sociology Society. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 505 Park Avenue, New York 22, 1958. 93 p.

BRODY, ALEXANDER. *The American State and Higher Education.* Washington, American Council on Education, 1935. 251 p.

CAPLOW, THEODORE. "Criteria of Organizational Success." *Social Forces* 32: 1–19, Oct. 1953.

CHAPIN, F. STUART. "Social Institutions and Voluntary Associations," in *Review of Sociology.* J. B. Gittler, *ed.* New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1957.

CHARTERS, W. W. *Jr.* "The School as a Social System." *Review of Educational Research* 22: 41–50, Feb. 1952.

COLADARCI, ARTHUR P., *and* JACOB W. GETZELS. *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration.* Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1955. 28 p.

CORSON, JOHN J. *An Exploration of the Governance of Colleges and Universities.* Unpublished report to the Carnegie Corporation. New York, The Corporation, 1959.

DEFERRARI, ROY J., *ed. College Organization and Administration.* Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1947. 403 p.

DENNISON, CHARLES P. *Faculty Rights and Obligations in Eight Independent Liberal Arts Colleges.* New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955. 186 p.

DOYLE, Rev. EDWARD A. *Status and Functions of the Departmental Chairman.* Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1953. 138 p.

EUWEMA, BEN. "The Organization of the Department." *The Educational Record* 34: 38–43, Jan. 1953.

GRIFFITHS, DANIEL E. *Administrative Theory.* New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959. 123 p.

[1] This list includes references used in the report. It does not constitute a bibliography of relevant literature. Also, by the time of publication, it is likely that some references identified as manuscripts may have been published.

GRIFFITHS, DANIEL E. "Development of Criterion of Success in School Administration." *Annual Report.* University Council for Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: The Council, Ohio State University, 1959.

GULICK, LUTHER H., *and* L. URWICK, *eds. Papers On the Science of Administration.* New York, Institute of Public Administration, 1937. 195 p.

HALPIN, ANDREW W., *ed. Administrative Theory in Education.* Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958. 188 p.

HEMPHILL, JOHN K. "Leadership Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputation of College Departments." *The Journal of Educational Psychology* 46: 385–401, Nov. 1955.

HOMANS, GEORGE C. *The Human Group.* New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950. xxvi+484 p.

KROEPSCH, ROBERT H. *An Investigation of Unfulfilled Faculty Expectations and Their Relation to the Organizationl Structure of a College.* Unpublished thesis. Harvard University, 1951.

LEFFLAND, K. WILLIAM. *The College Administration and Faculty.* Unpublished thesis. University of Southern California, 1959.

LITCHFIELD, EDWARD H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 1, No. 1: 3–29, June 1956.

———. "Organization in Large American Universities." *The Journal of Higher Education* 30: 353–364, Oct. 1959.

PALEY, WILLIAM S., *chairman. The Role of the Trustees of Columbia University.* Report of the Special Trustees Committee adopted by the Trustees, Nov. 4, 1957. New York, Columbia University.

PARSONS, TALCOTT. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization, I and II." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 1, Nos. 1 and 2: 63–85 and 225–239, June and Sept. 1956.

RAUH, MORTON A. *College and University Trusteeship.* Yellow Springs, Ohio, The Antioch Press, 1959. 112 p.

RIESMAN, DAVID. "Planning in Higher Education: Some Notes on Patterns and Problems." *Human Organization* 18: 12–17, spring 1959.

———. *Constraint and Variety in American Education.* Garden City, New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958. 174 p. (Doubleday Anchor Books.)

RUML, BEARDSLEY. *Memo To a College Trustee.* New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959. 94 p.

RUSSELL, JOHN DALE. *The Final Report of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan.* Lansing, Mich., Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, Box 240, State Capitol, 1958. 185 p.

SELZNICK, PHILIP. *Leadership in Administration.* White Plains, New York, Row, Peterson & Co., 1957. 162 p.

SIMON, HERBERT A. *Administrative Behavior,* 2d ed. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1957. xlviii plus 259 p.

STEPHENS, RICHARD W. *The Academic Administrator: Role of the University President.* Unpublished thesis. University of North Carolina, 1956.

STONE, DONALD C. "Perspectives of a President on the Rights, Responsibilities, and Relationships of a College Faculty." *Educational Record* 37: 285–291, Oct. 1956.

STUIT, DEWEY B., GERALD C. HELMSTADTER, *and* NORMAN FREDERIKSEN. *Survey of College Evaluation Methods and Needs.* Princeton, N.J., Educational Testing Service, 1956.

TAYLOR, RICHARD ROBB. *The American University as a Behavioral System.* Unpublished thesis. University of North Carolina, 1958.

TYLER, RALPH W. "Insights from the Behavioral Sciences," in *Faculty-Administration Relationships.* Frank C. Abbott, *ed.* Washington, American Council on Education, 1958.

WILSON, LOGAN. *The Academic Man.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1942. 248 p.

APPENDIX I

IN RECENT YEARS, a number of doctoral theses have appeared which bear upon the problems of academic administration. These constitute a good source of information. Representative titles are listed below:

1957

PHILIP BENEVENTO, *Administrative Communication: A Study of Its Relationship to Administrative Leadership*, Syracuse University.

GORDON B. CLEVELAND, *A Theoretical Analysis of Administrative Policy-Making*, University of North Carolina.

BASIL SPYROS GEORGOPOULOS, *The Normative Structure of Social Systems: A Study of Organizational Effectiveness*, University of Michigan.

REECE J. MCGEE, *A Study in Ambience: The Numerical Analysis of Interaction Groupings in a Large Scale Organization*, University of Minnesota.

ROBERT MILTON NORTHROP, *Administrative Doctrine and Administrative Behavior: The AEC Experience*, University of Michigan.

CHARLES E. SUMMER, JR., *University Education of Administrators: A Statement and Evaluation of Goals; The Development of Administrative Effectiveness*, Columbia University.

1958

GEORGE HAROLD AXINN, *The Relation of Personnel Selection and Salary Administration to Organizational Effectiveness in The Cooperative Extension Service in Michigan*, The University of Wisconsin.

JOHN LEWIS FORBES, *A Theory of Administrative Leadership for Contemporary Education*, Michigan State University.

SAMUEL MURRAY LONG, *The Coordination of Instructional, Administrative, and Student Personnel Services in Pennsylvania's State Teachers Colleges*, The Pennsylvania State University.

DAVID LOREN MCKENNA, *A Study of Power and Interpersonal Relationships in the Administration of Higher Education*, University of Michigan.

1959

MARY E. WEBER GOSS, *Physicians in Bureaucracy: A Case Study of Professional Pressures on Organizational Roles*, Columbia University.

ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *The Emerging Evening College: A Study of Faculty Organization and Academic Control in Ten Eastern University Evening Colleges*, Columbia University.

APPENDIX II

THE COOPERATION and assistance of a number of scholars and administrators actively concerned with research in academic administration has helped substantially with this report. This appendix contains a partial list of the institutions contacted. It is included here as a possible beginning for a directory of locations at which work is in progress on matters related to administration in higher education.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY. A considerable number of pertinent articles have appeared in the journal of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, *Administrative Science Quarterly.*

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. At Teachers College, Prof. Daniel E. Griffiths and his associates have underway a number of projects related to educational administration, particularly for the public schools, and have published several books on administrative theory. Prof. Karl W. Bigelow has contributed a bibliography (*Selected Books for the College and University Administrator*, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958) and has under his direction a doctoral program for students majoring in college and university administration.

The Bureau of Applied Social Research of the University has sponsored studies, such as that on the sociology of medical education, which offer pertinent data and ideas.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY. The Institute for College and University Administrators is concerned primarily with assisting individuals to better understand and perform their work by means of conferences built upon the case method. The Department of Social Relations has under consideration studies related to higher education but not specifically to the problems of administration.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY. Prof. Edward E. Edwards in the School of Business there has been studying ways of improving faculty productivity and the mechanics of our present system which affect the efficiency of faculty instruction and student learning.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. W. B. Brookover of this bureau is chairman of the Committee on the Sociology of Education of the American Sociological Society.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. The Midwest Administration Center organization is now in the seventh year of publishing the *Administrator's Notebook* which includes accounts of a number of relevant studies, although they generally focus upon public school administration. Its program has emphasized administrative theory, as referred to in this report.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY. A very informative President's Seminar was sponsored by this university for its own staff on the subject of role and responsibilities of departmental chairmen. Held in April of 1959, the seminar brought together deans and academic department heads.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, THE STUDY OF THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENCY. This study, under the direction of Harold W. Dodds, is referred to above.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL. This organization with headquarters in New York City has considered the subject of social science research and higher education. A memorandum on this matter has elaborated on the problems of research and contributions possible from the social sciences.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD. At present this organization has two kinds of relevant activities underway: (1) a survey of the administration of organized research in universities in the South, and (2) a study of institutional research activities and of ways this activity can be more widely used as a basis for decision making.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY. Ralph W. Tyler, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, has been concerned with the application of the behavioral sciences to the problems of academic administration. Among other activities, he has produced an unpublished paper on the problems of appraisal in colleges and universities. Prof. W. H. Cowley has been developing for more than a decade a comprehensive analysis of higher education. Administrative process and structure form only one part of his unpublished work, *Appraisal of American Higher Education: 1956*. Professor Cowley has completed five of eight parts of this manuscript which examines the total operation of colleges and universities within the context of their historical background and contemporary culture. He has under his direction a doctoral program for students majoring in higher education and planning careers in administration.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA. The Center for Study of Higher Education has underway a 5-year study of selected colleges, their character, and their impact on students. The ramifications of the work of its staff has pertinence primarily at this time to an understanding of what this report has designated as the institutional setting.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH. The staff of the Administrative Science Center has begun study based upon the social sciences to develop insights of a general nature valuable to specific administrative situations encountered in various fields, including that of education. Two illustrative studies, now underway, are concerned with the adaptation of a school system to a new superintendent and with an analysis of how a number of business executives perceive themselves and their tasks.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS. Among other activities, Reece McGee is studying the working conditions of junior faculty members at two large State universities. His papers include one which considers the "process and organization of administration."

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY. Alvin W. Gouldner, chairman of the Department of Sociology, has been studying the problem of social roles of participants in organizations and how these affect organizational behavior. This is reported in two articles in the *Administrative Science Quarterly* of December 1957 and March 1958.

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. This organization has taken the initiative to report various studies made by institutions within their geographical area. Their findings are published in *Institutional Research in the West*, 1959.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1960 O—212-778

Reactions

In order that the series, "New Dimensions in Higher Education," may more accurately measure the developments examined and better ascertain the disposition of colleges and universities to experiment, reader reaction is sought. To prompt such a response, in this instance to administration, the following questions are raised:

1. What kinds of study and theory in administration of colleges and universities have not been mentioned in this report?
2. What insights in other fields, such as governmental and industrial organization, may have value for academic administration?
3. What kinds of specific yet pervasive problems should be treated in reports of this sort or in further studies of administrative effectiveness?
4. What has your institution done administratively to anticipate the problems of expansion and quality during the 1960–70 decade?
5. Can you suggest any other conceptual scheme to categorize research and thinking on academic administration?
6. How can the Office of Education help in more effective administration of higher education programs?

Kindly address reactions to:

DR. HAROLD A. HASWELL
Director
Higher Education Programs Branch
Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.